UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/059,426	01/31/2002	Akihiko Koga	500.41128X00	6837

20457	7590	04/22/2004

ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP
1300 NORTH SEVENTEENTH STREET
SUITE 1800
ARLINGTON, VA 22209-9889

EXAMINER
HARRIS, CHANDA L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3714	

DATE MAILED: 04/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/059,426	KOGA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Chanda L. Harris	3714	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *22 December 2003*.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-8* is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) *1-8* is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☒ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
        1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
            application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

In response to the amendment filed on 12/22/03, Claims 1-8 are pending.

Claim Objections

Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- Claim 1, line 19: "which any of behaviors is to be performed" should be

  --which any of the behaviors are to be performed --.

- Claim 1, line 27: "referring with" should be --referring to --.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Pellegrino et al. (US 6,149,441) in view of Cook et al. (US 6,201,948).

1.   [Claim 1]: Regarding Claim 1, Pellegrino discloses wherein each of said plurality

of clients (i.e. client computers) comprises resource operation transmission means (i.e.

education system) and resource display means (i.e. Home Page via a liquid crystal

display or cathode ray tube), said resource operation transmission means transmitting a request for operating resources of the learning management server together with a learner ID for identifying a learner (e.g. student, support user, teacher, administrative user) using said client, to said learning management server (i.e. server computer); said learning management server comprises resource operation means (i.e. education system) for operating resources of said learning management server in accordance with both the request by said client and a judgment taking the learner into consideration, resource reference means (i.e. Home Page) for notifying said client of the contents of the resources, and operation interpretation means (i.e. education system) for interpreting the resource operation request sent to said resource operation means. See Col.6: 60-66 and Col.9: 21-33. Pellegrino discloses wherein said learning management server further comprises activity model data representative of a set of roles (e.g., teacher, student, support and administrative), including a role which relates to the learner transmitting the request, a set of behaviors which can be performed by each of the roles, and another set of roles for which any of the behaviors is to be performed (i.e. features of the system depending upon the 'type' ascribed to the user). It is best understood by Examiner that Pellegrino's invention indicates all accessible behaviors. See Col.10: 67-Col.11: 4. Means for storing a correspondence of each learner ID and resource (i.e. feature) relative to each role and means for interpreting the request as behaviors between the resources would have been inherent features of Pellegrino in. light of Col.10: 67 – Col.11: 4. Pellegrino discloses wherein said resource operation means of said learning management server converts the request into data

representative of behaviors between resources and learner IDs be referring to the

operation table, and inquires said operation interpretation means whether an operation

represented by the converted data is permitted and wherein said operation

interpretation means checks whether there is a role assigned to the learner ID and

resource and being coincident with the contents of the activity model data to thereby

judge whether the request is permitted, and returns judgment results according to the

judgment to said resource operation means (i.e. system permitting access to certain

features of the system depending on the 'type' ascribed to the user and identifying

authorized and identifying authorized users). See Col.10: 67 – Col.11: 4. Pellegrino

discloses if the judgment results indicate a permission, said resource operation means

operates the resource, and said resource display means of said client receives resource

operation results (e.g. Home page) from said resource operation means and displays

the resource operation results. See Col.9: 29-33 and Col.10: 67-Col.11: 4. Examiner

maintains that Pellegrino discloses activity model data and that the activity model data

relates to a link between a set of roles (i.e., teacher, student, support and

administrative) and a set of links indicating behaviors (i.e., certain features of the

system depending upon the "type" ascribed to the user) between the role names.

Teacher, student, support and administrator are representative of a set of roles of users

of Pellegrino's invention. Examiner disagrees that Applicant's argument that Pellegrino

does not disclose an activity model data as recited in the claims of the present

invention. The "features" in Pellegrino corresponds to behaviors that can be performed

by the different roles of his system which corresponds to the activity model data as

recited in the claims of the present application. For example, Pellegrino list the many behaviors afforded to a teacher role of his system in Col.10: 50-66.

Examiner did not assert that Pellegrino discloses an operation interpretation table. Instead, Examiner asserted that Pellegrino discloses an operation interpretation means.

Pellegrino does not disclose expressly a role table and an operation interpretation table. However, Cook teaches the concept of a role table (e.g., a student's role in changing agent behavior) and an operation interpretation table. See Table 13 and Table 7, respectively. Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate a role table and an operation interpretation table into the method and system of Pellegrino, in light of the teaching of Cook, in order to facilitate processing input.

2.   [Claim 2]: Regarding Claim 2, Pellegrino discloses wherein a plurality of activity model data sets is provided (i.e. features of the system depending upon the 'type' ascribed to the user), and said operation interpretation means notifies said resource operation means of a permission of a request operation if the behavior descriptive data representative of behavior between resources and learner IDs is coincident with any one of the activity model data sets. See Col.10:67-Col.11:4.

3.   [Claim 3]: Regarding Claim 3, Pellegrino discloses wherein monitoring status display means (i.e. cathode ray tube or liquid crystal display) is connected to the network (i.e. intranet or Internet); said learning management server comprises an activity log (i.e. database) for storing behavior interpretation data (i.e. logon/logoff

activity) including the behavior descriptive data of the request sent to said resource

operation means (i.e. logon/logoff) and role name assignment (e.g. student, teacher)

when there is a match with the activity model data, and said resource operation means

writes the behavior interpretation data when the resource is operated (i.e. tracks

logon/logoff activity); and said learning management server comprises learning status

monitoring means (i.e. User Management capability), said learning status monitoring

means making said monitoring status display means display the contents of the activity

log (e.g. logon/logoff activity). See Col.6: 42-45, 60-66, Col.10: 67-Col.11:4, and

Col.26:52-64.

4.   [Claim 4]: Regarding Claim 4, Pellegrino discloses wherein said learning

management server comprises monitoring condition data (e.g. logon/logoff activity), said

learning status monitoring means evaluates a condition in the monitoring condition data

when activity log changes (e.g. logon/logoff activity), and if the evaluate dcondition is

satisfied, notifies this fact to monitoring status display means , and said monitoring

status display means displays an activity status (e.g. logon/logoff activity). See Col.26:

52-64.

5.   [Claim 5]: Regarding Claim 5, Pellegrino discloses a plurality of resource

operation specification data sets each including an operation pattern (i.e. features

ascribed to a user), an interpretation method (inherent) and an operation method

(inherent), and said resource operation means searches the resource operation

specification data having the operation pattern matching the received request, executes

the corresponding interpretation method to form behavior interpretation data (i.e.

features ascribed to a user), inquires said operation interpretation means whether an

operation corresponding to the behavior interpretation data is permitted, and if

permitted, operates the resource by using the operation method written in the resource

operation specification data (i.e. identifying authorized users and permitting access to

certain features of the system depending upon the 'type' ascribed to the user). See

Col.10: 67-Col.11: 4.

Pellegrino does not disclose expressly a resource management procedure table.

However, Anderson teaches tables to store information and associations between the

tables on p.3, [0060]. Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the aforementioned limitation

into the method and system of Pellegrino, in light of the teaching of Anderson, in order

to provide exemplary data structures for storing information and the relationships

between information.

6.   [Claim 6]: Regarding Claim 6, Pellegrino discloses storing a correspondence

between each learner name (e.g. student, teacher) and storing a correspondence

between an operation request (i.e. logging on to the educational system) and a behavior

name (i.e. feature of the system); and means for determining an access privilege to

resources of the learning management server in response to a client request (i.e.

educational system). See Col.9: 29-33 and Col.10: 67-Col.11: 4.

Pellegrino does not disclose expressly a table for storing a correspondence

between each learner name and a role and an operation table. However, Anderson

teaches tables to store information and associations between the tables on p.3, [0060].

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the aforementioned limitations into the method and system of Pellegrino, in light of the teaching of Anderson, in order to provide exemplary data structures for storing information and the relationships between information.

7.   [Claims 7-8]: Regarding Claims 7-8, Pellegrino discloses determining an access privilege to resources of the learning management server in response to a client request. See Col.10: 67-Col.11: 4. Pellegrino teaches a computer executable program (e.g. application program) for realizing the access privilege method according to claim 7. See Col.8: 9-12.

Pellegrino does not disclose expressly preparing a table for storing a correspondence between each learner name and a role and an operation table. However, Anderson teaches tables to store information and associations between the tables on p.3, [0060]. Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the aforementioned limitations into the method and system of Pellegrino, in light of the teaching of Anderson, in order to provide exemplary data structures for storing information and the relationships between information.

Citation of Pertinent Prior Art

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Denious et al. (US 6,622,003)

    -role assignments for students

- Parker (US 2003/0207245)

    -role ID

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s)

of rejection. See rejection above. Therefore, this action is made NON-FINAL.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Chanda L. Harris whose telephone number is 703-308-

8358. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:30am-4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Tom Hughes can be reached on 703-308-1806. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Chanda L. Harris
Examiner
Art Unit 3714

ch.